

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,624	12/16/2003	Hironobu Takahama	032026	2652
38834	7590 06/30/2004		EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			SEMUNEGUS, LULIT	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	ON, DC 20036		3641	
			DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/735,624	TAKAHAMA, HIRONOBU			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Lulit Semunegus	3641			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address			
THE - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Isoms of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from t, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims	•				
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1,2,4 and 5</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>3</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o					
	on Papers	·	•			
• •	•	ar.				
,—	9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
10)	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)						
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/16/2003</u> .	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/735,624

Art Unit: 3641

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made
- 2. Claims 1-2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan (6,568,310) in view of Mejia (5,463,929).

In regards to claims 1 and 4, Morgan teaches a cockpit door of an aircraft (10) interposed between a cockpit and a passenger cabin of the aircraft, the cockpit door (col. 2, lines 43-46) comprising: a reinforcement member fixed to an interior of the door (fig. 4-5), the reinforcement member comprising a body formed by laminating multiple layers of aromatic polyamide fiber sheets (col. 3, lines 37-59) with thermoplastic adhesive (col. 2, lines 50-67). Morgan does not expressly teach the mounting portion bent 90 degrees. Mejia teaches reinforcement member (10) which is formed by laminating multiple layers and a mounting portion formed to a rim portion of the body, the mounting portion bent 90 degrees and fixed to the door by rivets (col. 6, lines 23-52). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to have the reinforcement member of Morgan bent 90 degrees to reinforce the edges of such material to prevent failure due to delaminating under impact. In regards to claim 2, Morgan teaches the door comprises a flap (12).

Art Unit: 3641

In regards to claim 1 and 5, examiner would like to point out that the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production, if the product (reinforcement member) in the product by process claims the same as the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. See In re Thorpe, 777 F. 2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Dovey et al (6,702,232) teaches a cockpit door of an aircraft comprising two flaps (fig. 1).
 - Mandall (6,240,858) teaches a cockpit door of an aircraft with a reinforcement ember fixed to an interior of the door (figures).
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lulit Semunegus whose telephone number is (703) 306-5960. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on (703) 306-4198. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/735,624 Page 4

Art Unit: 3641

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Luli Semunegus

Examiner
Art Unit 3641
